

INTERNATIONAL **FACT-CHECKING** NETWORK @ Poynter.

Edits made by the organization following this assessment

CRITERION #3.1

Original assessment: Partial compliance

El Objetivo's explanation of their edits in this criterion:

We have improved transparency in our website, explaining our sources policy and the way we work with sources identification not only during the show, but also in the fact-checks we provide additionally in the website.

Assessment of the improvements made:

El Objetivo has added a new page in its website where, indeed, a clear explanation about the transparency of sources is provided. Therefore, the assessment of criterion **#3.1** upgrades to **complete compliance**.

CRITERIA #4.1 and #4.2

Original assessment: partial compliance (4.1.) and none compliance (4.2)

El Objetivo's explanation of their edits in these two criteria:

We have created a new section in our website dedicated to transparency of funding and organization (<http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/transparencia/>) , explaining the companies involved in the production of the program. Also we have update the "the Team" (Equipo) <http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/equipo/>) chapter in the web, publishing information of the "authors and key actors behind fact-checking". The news published in the site will be also have the firm and id of the author.

Assessment of the improvements made:

The improvements described above have been applied. The assessment of the criteria **#4.1** and **#4.2** upgrades to **complete compliance**.

CRITERION #5.1

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

Original assessment: none compliance

El Objetivo's explanation of their edits in this criterion:

We have now available a complete and accessible explanation of our methodology in the web. <http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/transparencia/>.

Assessment of the improvements made:

The improvement described above has been applied. The assessment of criterion **#5.1** upgrades to **complete compliance**.

CRITERION #5.2

Original assessment: partial compliance

El Objetivo's explanation of their edits in this criterion:

*We have added an email for comments and complaints. The contact page forces people to accept a legal regulation about personal data because it is imperative by law, in order to protect personal information of the user.
http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/quieres-contactar-ana-pastor-equipo-objetivo-hazlo-traves-este-formulario_2017022858b549da0cf28e3b3aa69aa2.html*

Assessment of the improvements made:

The improvements described above have been applied. The legal requirement of providing personal data by informants or audience members is true. Although that requirement could be fulfilled differently, the procedure followed by El Objetivo is totally acceptable. Therefore, the assessment of criterion **#5.2** upgrades to **complete compliance**.

CRITERION #6.1

Original assessment: none compliance

El Objetivo's explanation of their edits in this criterion:

We have published our "right for correction" policy in the web, so the audience can

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

*have this type of info more easily and accessible, following the assessor suggestions.
<http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/transparencia/>.*

Assessment of the improvements made:

The improvement described above has been applied. The assessment of criterion #6.1 upgrades to **complete compliance**.

Name of the organization: El Objetivo (Spain)

Name of the assessor: Ramón Salaverría

The original assessment (March 13, 2017) about El Objetivo's compliance of IFCN code of principles was as follows:

1. Organization
 - Criterion #1.1 – **Complete** compliance
 - Criterion #1.2 – **Partial** compliance
2. Nonpartisanship and fairness
 - Criterion #2.1 – **Complete** compliance
 - Criterion #2.2 – **Complete** compliance
3. Transparency of sources
 - Criterion #3.1 – **Partial** compliance
4. Transparency of funding and of organization
 - Criterion #4.1 – **Partial** compliance
 - Criterion #4.2 – **None** compliance
 - Criterion #4.3 – **Complete** compliance
5. Transparency of methodology
 - Criterion #5.1 – **None** compliance
 - Criterion #5.2 – **Partial** compliance
6. Open and honest corrections policy
 - Criterion #6.1 – **None** compliance

Considering the evidences detailed above, the re-assessment (May 23, 2017) of El Objetivo's compliance of the code of principles remains as follows:

1. Organization
 - Criterion #1.1 – **Complete** compliance
 - Criterion #1.2 – **Complete** compliance

INTERNATIONAL **FACT-CHECKING** NETWORK @ Poynter.

2. Nonpartisanship and fairness
Criterion #2.1 – **Complete** compliance
Criterion #2.2 – **Complete** compliance
3. Transparency of sources
Criterion #3.1 – **Complete** compliance
4. Transparency of funding and of organization
Criterion #4.1 – **Complete** compliance
Criterion #4.2 – **Complete** compliance
Criterion #4.3 – **Complete** compliance
5. Transparency of methodology
Criterion #5.1 – **Complete** compliance
Criterion #5.2 – **Complete** compliance
6. Open and honest corrections policy
Criterion #6.1 – **Complete** compliance

According to this re-assessment, assessor's recommendation to the IFCN board is:

- **Accept**

Checklist for assessors

Please assess the following criteria when evaluating an organization's respect of the code of principles. Please justify the compliance levels selected with a short (500 words max.) report below each criterion.

1) Organization	5
2) Nonpartisanship and fairness	6
3) Transparency of sources	9
4) Transparency of funding and of organization	9
5) Transparency of methodology	10
6) Open and honest corrections policy	12

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

1) Organization

The code of principles is for organizations that regularly publish nonpartisan reports on the accuracy of statements by public figures, major institutions, and other widely circulated claims of interest to society.

COMPLIANCE	None	Partial	Complete
The signatory is a legally registered organization set up exclusively for the purpose of fact-checking or the distinct fact-checking section of a legally registered media outlet or research institution.			X [Explanation below: 1.1]
The signatory publishes reports that evaluate distinct claims exclusively on the basis of their accuracy. It does so on a regular basis (an average of at least one report a week over the previous three months).			X [Explanation below: 1.2]

→ **Evidence required from signatory:** (a) evidence of legal registration or organizational status; (b) links to website or location of fact checks published in the previous three months.

EXPLANATION to 1.1: **Complete** compliance

El Objetivo (<http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/>) is a weekly TV news show, broadcasted in Spain by LaSexta, a general content TV channel owned by Atresmedia. The TV show is produced by Globomedia. All these brands and companies are legally registered organizations. Among its different sections, the TV show includes every week a part dedicated to fact-checking (“Pruebas de verificación”): <http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/prueba-verificacion/>

EXPLANATION to 1.2: **Complete** compliance

Under the direction of the widely recognized journalist Ana Pastor, *El Objetivo* started being broadcasted on June 2013. Since then, this TV news show has been broadcasted each and every year, with the logical summer breaks.

Throughout the last three full months (Dec. 2016 – Feb. 2017) the TV show has broadcasted the following amounts of fact-checks (see: <http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/prueba-verificacion-1/>):

Dic. 2016: 8

Jan. 2017: 17

Feb. 2017: 17

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

2) Nonpartisanship and fairness

Principle 1 “We fact-check claims using the same standard for every fact check. We do not concentrate our fact-checking on any one side. We follow the same process for every fact check and let the evidence dictate our conclusions. We do not advocate or take policy positions on the issues we fact-check.”

COMPLIANCE	None	Partial	Complete
The signatory demonstrates that fact checks cover a variety of subjects or speakers and do not unduly concentrate on one side of the topic/context they fact-check			X [Explanation below: 2.1]
The signatory must not support a candidate in any election nor advocate or take policy positions on any issues not strictly related to fact-checking. The signatory should also explain its policies on preventing staff from direct involvement in political parties and advocacy organizations.			X [Explanation below: 2.2]

→ **Evidence required from signatory:** (a) links to ten fact checks proving scope and consistency of fact-checking accompanied by a short explanation of how the organization strives to maintain standards. The assessors reserve the right to select examples beyond the ten fact checks. (b) policy regarding advocacy/political positions from the organization and its staff.

EXPLANATION to 2.1: **Complete** compliance

[Assesor’s disclosure: the initial assessment of this category was of **partial** compliance. However, that judgment was based on evidences which, thanks to the explanations provided by El Objetivo, were proved wrong. This assessor apologizes for his error.

In order to provide a full clarification of the corrections and to keep track of the changes made, the **original wrong assessment** (March 16, 2017) is provided again. After that, a **corrected assessment** (May 23, 2017) is added below.]

[Original wrong assessment BEGINS ↓]

El Objetivo covers in its fact-checking section (*Pruebas de verificación*) a significant variety of subjects (politics and business, mainly) and speakers (it fact-checks both national and international leaders’ statements). However, there is a notable tendency to fact-check

INTERNATIONAL **FACT-CHECKING** NETWORK @ Poynter.

statements coming from spokespersons of center and center-right political parties, and not that much from leaders of leftist political parties, which are more aligned with the editorial line of LaSexta.

Here is the breakdown of the 42 fact-checks broadcasted by *El Objetivo* since Dec.1, 2016 to Feb. 28, 2017:

- **Popular Party** [Partido Popular, PP], center-right, the biggest (1st) party in the Spanish parliament and now ruling the national Government: **27 fact-checks**
- **Socialist Party** [Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE], center-left, the 3rd biggest political party in the Spanish Parliament: **9 fact-checks**
- **Citizens' Party** [Ciudadanos, C's], center-liberal, the 4th biggest political party in the Spanish Parliament, somehow supporting the national Government of PP: **4 fact-checks (*)**
- **Podemos** [We Can], far-leftist, the 2nd biggest political party in the Spanish Parliament: **1 fact-check (*)**
- **Trump's U.S. administration: 2 fact-checks**

Although it's understandable the special scrutiny to the political party that rules Spain's national government (27 of 42 fact-checks during the period analyzed were targeted to that party), what is arguable is the **almost total (*) absence of fact-checks** to leaders or spokespersons of the 2nd biggest party in the Parliament, **Podemos**. Throughout three months analyzed, this party was subject to just one (*) fact-check.

In order to get a deeper analysis of this weakness, older fact-checks were also randomly analyzed. It was found that, in the past, *El Objetivo* actually broadcasted a handful of fact-checks focused on Podemos. However, the overall impression was that on average they were substantially less than those focused on other political parties.

This unbalanced number of fact-checks is especially problematic considering that Podemos is currently ruling many big municipalities in the country, including those of the two biggest cities, Madrid and Barcelona. This scarcity of fact-checks to Podemos, second biggest party in the Parliament, is especially notable considering that *El Objetivo* broadcasted consistently much more fact-checks focused on the third (9 fact-checks) and even the fourth (4 fact-checks) political parties in the Parliament. The latter party, Ciudadanos, is not ruling any national or regional government not even any big municipality, but still it has been subject to a closer scrutiny than Podemos.

Considering all the evidences above, this assessor concludes that, at least to some extent, *El Objetivo* should improve its nonpartisanship, in order to provide a really balanced news coverage that avoids an "unduly concentration on one side of the topic/context it fact-checks".

(*) Note: Within the three-month period analyzed, the only fact-check of a news that affects to Podemos was about a controversy of a politician close to that party (the mayoress of Barcelona)

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

with another politician of Ciudadanos. This is why this fact-check has been counted twice; once for each political party. According to El Objetivo's research, the fact-checked news proved that Podemos' leader was right. (See: http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/prueba-verificacion/se-han-duplicado-los-desahucios-en-barcelona-desde-que-ada-colau-es-alcaldesa_20170115587bf64d0cf21c707d15ca39.html)

[Original wrong assessment ENDS ↑]

[Corrected assessment BEGINS ↓]

The assessment above mistakenly placed Podemos as the second biggest political party in the Spanish Parliament. It is not. Actually, Podemos went to 2016 general elections in coalition with another political party (Izquierda Unida), in a joint candidacy called Unidos Podemos. This coalition was third in those elections (with 71 MP), behind the Socialist Party, that was second (with 85 MP).

Therefore, the original judgment of somewhat unbalanced treatment by El Objetivo to the different Spanish political parties must be reassessed. On the contrary, it can be concluded, indeed, that El Objetivo covers with reasonable fairness all the Spanish political parties in its fact-checking section, according to their respective level of representation in the Congress and regardless their ideological alignment.

As an additional evidence of this fairness, it can be taken into account that El Objetivo "dedicated a whole program to evaluate the first year of both Madrid and Barcelona new (Podemos') Governments management," as El Objetivo has reminded in its explanations. Although that specific program went beyond their fact-checking section, and therefore it wasn't part of the contents to be analyzed by this assessor, it can be interpreted, indeed, as an additional proof of El Objetivo's commitment to a fair and balanced approach in their analysis of Spanish political reality.

Considering all the above as well as the additional arguments and evidences provided by El Objetivo in their explanations report, this assessor concludes that his original assessment on "nonpartisanship and fairness" must be upgraded from "partial compliance" to "complete compliance."

[Corrected wrong assessment ENDS ↑]

EXPLANATION to 2.2: **Complete** compliance

Since the beginning of its fact-checking service in 2013, *El Observador* has not supported a candidate in any election nor advocate or take policy positions on any issues not strictly related to fact-checking.

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

3) Transparency of sources

Principle 2 “We want our readers to be able to verify our findings themselves. We provide all sources in enough detail that readers can replicate our work, except in cases where a source’s personal security could be compromised. In such cases, we provide as much detail as possible.”

COMPLIANCE	None	Partial	Complete
The signatory links to the sources of the claim it is fact-checking and the evidence it uses to fact-check it (or identifies them in detail where these can’t be linked).		X [Explanation below: 3.1]	

→ **Evidence required from signatory:** A brief explanation (500 words max) of how sources are provided in enough detail that readers could replicate the fact check. If the signatory has a policy on sources, it should be shared here.

EXPLANATION to 3.1: **Partial** compliance

Being a TV news show, *El Objetivo* can hardly provide links to their viewers. However, that transparency could be much improved in its website. Many times the section of its website devoted to fact-checks (*Pruebas de verificación*, <http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/prueba-verificacion/>) just publishes short videos taken from the TV show, without any textual aid. In other cases, texts are added, but without links to original sources. Only in a few cases (18 of 42 fact-checks throughout the three-month period analyzed), these texts provided links to external sources that allowed people to check the information by themselves.

4) Transparency of funding and of organization

Principle 3 “We are transparent about our funding sources. If we accept funding from other organizations, we ensure that funders have no influence over the conclusions we reach in our reports. We detail the professional background of all key figures in our organization and explain our organizational structure and legal status. We clearly indicate a way for readers to communicate with us.”

COMPLIANCE	None	Partial	Complete
All signatories that are standalone organizations must have a page on their site detailing each source of funding over the past calendar year accounting for 5% or more of		X [Explanation below: 4.1]	

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

total revenue. This page should also set out an overview of spending that year and indicate the form in which the organization is registered (e.g. as a non-profit, as a company etc) and, if this would allow the public to verify certain financial information about it. NB Where an organization is the fact-checking section a media house, the signatory should make a statement on ownership, more detail may be required if this has not been disclosed publicly.			
All authors and key actors behind the fact-checking project must be clearly listed on the site and their biographies indicated.	X [Explanation below: 4.2]		
Signatories must indicate an easy way for the public to reach out directly to the fact-checking initiative with complaints or comments.			X [Explanation below: 4.3]

→ **Evidence required from signatory:** (a) a link to the page detailing funding sources or statement of ownership (b) a link to the section detailing all active authors and key actors behind the project with their biographies (c) a link to the section where readers can contact the organization

EXPLANATION to 4.1: **Partial** compliance

The TV show *El Objetivo* does not provide on its website (<http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/>) any specific information “detailing each source of funding over the past calendar year accounting for 5% or more of total revenue”. There is a way, however, of getting at least part of that information within the site of Atresmedia corporation (<http://www.atresmediacorporacion.com/sobre-nosotros/>), owner of LaSexta. It takes some effort and time to find that information and the public can easily get lost trying to find it. Therefore a clearer, more accesible data would be appreciated.

EXPLANATION to 4.2: **None** compliance

El Objetivo's website does not provide any information about “authors and key actors behind the fact-checking project”, not even of its main TV presenter, Ana Pastor (in her case, there is only a news aggregator: http://www.lasexta.com/temas/ana_pastor-1). The news published on *El Objetivo's* website are anonymous. and there's not even a general email address to which

EXPLANATION to 4.3: **Complete** compliance

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

El Objetivo's website provides a specific, easy-to-find contact page for comments and complaints: http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/quieres-contactar-ana-pastor-equipo-objetivo-hazlo-traves-este-formulario_2017022858b549da0cf28e3b3aa69aa2.html We suggest, however, to edit the URL of that page, in order to make it easier to find and share (something like this: <http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/contacto.html>).

5) Transparency of methodology

Principle 4 “*We explain the methodology we use to select, research, write, edit, publish and correct our fact checks. We encourage readers to send us claims to fact-check and are transparent on why and how we fact-check.*”

COMPLIANCE	None	Partial	Complete
The signatory explains its fact-checking methodology publicly and clearly in an accessible place.	X [Explanation below: 5.1]		
The signatory indicates to readers how they can send claims to fact-check while making it clear what readers can legitimately expect will be fact-checked and what isn't fact-checkable.		X [Explanation below: 5.2]	

→ **Evidence required from signatory:** (a) a link to the page with a methodology that should include how the signatory selects claims to fact-check and sources to provide evidence for its conclusions (b) link to the page where readers can submit claims to fact-check.

EXPLANATION to 5.2: **Partial** compliance

Although *El Objetivo's* website has a contact page (http://www.lasexta.com/programas/el-objetivo/quieres-contactar-ana-pastor-equipo-objetivo-hazlo-traves-este-formulario_2017022858b549da0cf28e3b3aa69aa2.html) through which people can submit comments and complaints, it does not provide a specific email address. Adding that email address would be appreciated as a measure of additional transparency, because the current online form of *El Objetivo's* contact page forces the people to accept some legal regulations about the usage by Atresmedia of their personal data as well as about any information they share.

Apart from the contact page, none of *El Objetivo's* web pages include any email account or contact link, through which users can easily send their claims.

INTERNATIONAL FACT-CHECKING NETWORK @ Poynter.

6) Open and honest corrections policy

Principle 5 “We publish our corrections policy and follow it scrupulously. We correct clearly and transparently in line with our corrections policy, seeking so far as possible to ensure that readers see the corrected version.”

COMPLIANCE	None	Partial	Complete
The signatory has a public corrections policy and can point to instances where it has implemented it in the past year if it has made an error.	X [Explanation below: 6.1]		

→ **Evidence required from signatory:** a link to the page with the corrections policy and one or two examples of a correction made, or correction requests handled, in the past year.

EXPLANATION to 6.1: **None** compliance

El Objetivo's website does not publish its corrections policy.

In the online form submitted by *El Objetivo* to IFCN, they claim that “if we make a mistake we correct ourselves the following week during the broadcast. We don’t have a specific organization’s handbook about it.” Then, they refer to one case in 2014 that they broadcasted a rectification.

In order to strengthen the corrections policy, this assessor has two suggestions:

- 1) To write and publicly share the corrections policy.
- 2) Whenever a correction will be made, not only broadcast that correction in the next TV show, but also publish it clearly and as soon as possible in the website as well.